IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 2359 of 1992

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA Sd/-

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

AMRUT M JOSHI

Versus

CHAIRMAN AND MANAGING DIRECTOR

Appearance:

MR NIKHIL S KARIEL for MR BP TANNA for Petitioner No. 1

MR RAJNI H MEHTA for Respondent No. 1

..... for Respondents No. 2-4

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA

Date of decision: 08/03/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. When the matter was called out, at the outset Mr.Rajni H. Mehta, learned advocate appearing on behalf of Respondent No.1 submitted that he had received written instruction to the effect that the petitioner has expired

sometime in 1997. However, Mr.Kariel, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner states that though he has sent phonogram two days back to verify the aforesaid statement, has not received any instructions either confirming or denying the aforesaid fact.

2. In view of these circumstances, the petition is disposed of as having become infructuous.

3. When the matter was admitted, it was ordered to be heard alongwith Spl.C.A. No.2066 of 1992. However, the parties agree that the said matter is different on facts, and hence, it is not necessary to hear both the matters together.

4. Rule is discharged. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(D.A.Mehta, J)

'Bhavesh'